Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Version is based — as against the critical text, derived by a genealogical study, chiefly from a few early uncials. This desire was met by Professor Sanday's invitation to a debate. The debate was thus between the school of Dean Burgon on the one side, and the followers of Dr. Hort on the other. The speakers were six: Miller, Gwilliam, and Bonus, as advocates of the traditional text, and Sanday, Allen, and Headlam, for the historico-critical method of Dr. Hort; the two sides being represented alternately, and Mr. Miller closing the debate. With participants so able and so deeply interested in the advocacy of their respective views, the debate could hardly have failed of interest, and the record of it has all the value of a plain and outspoken presentation of the two positions and methods, by eminent representatives of each. In some sections, however, there is a disappointing lack of coherence and grasp, which even the exigencies of public debate are not sufficient to explain. As to the upshot of the discussion, which must have been exhilaratingly vigorous and informal, Professor Sanday's side certainly seems, at least to a follower of Dr. Hort, to have had all the best of it. The book is edited by Mr. Miller.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE ZWEITE RÖMISCHE GEFANGENSCHAFT DES APOSTELS PAULUS. Eine kirchenhistorische und neutestamentliche Untersuchung. Von Lic. theol. RUDOLF STEINMETZ, Pastor zu Neuenkirchen. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1897. Pp. viii+244. M. 3.60.

A FULL and careful résumé of the arguments which have been urged by many scholars in support of Paul's second Roman imprisonment. The book contains nothing new, but is written clearly and in a candid spirit, and constitutes perhaps as good a defense as could be written of the author's thesis that Paul was released from his Roman imprisonment, and, after a journey to Spain and to the Orient, was again arrested and imprisoned. The first part of the book is devoted to the grounds, exclusive of the pastoral epistles, upon which the assumption of a second imprisonment is based; the second part to the pastoral epistles themselves as witnesses to such an imprisonment. The author pursues the proper course in endeavoring to show a second imprisonment probable on other grounds before considering the evidence of the pastoral epistles; but, as a matter of fact, his effort serves only to show again how little there is to be said in favor of the traditional opinion,

and how strikingly inadequate it is to destroy the tremendous presumption against that opinion furnished by the absolute silence of Luke and of all other early Christian apologists — a silence, the significance of which the author evidently entirely failed to realize.

In the second part the author defends at length the authenticity of the pastoral epistles, rightly regarding their evidence, if they be authentic, as conclusive. But here again his argument serves only to reveal the weakness of his case. As a matter of fact, the pastoral epistles are so un-Pauline in their general conception of Christianity — a conception which the author has failed to grasp in its totality — that they could not be regarded as authentic in their present form, even though Paul's second imprisonment were granted. And so both parts of the author's argument seem to us to break down as they have broken down before, and we fear that only those who are already convinced that the traditional opinion is correct will find the present defense of it convincing.

ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES TO THE PHILIPPIANS AND TO PHILEMON. By REV. MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature in Union Theological Seminary. (International Critical Commentary.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897. Pp. xlv + 201. $2, *net.*

WE have now five New Testament volumes of this series; and, unequal in some ways as the contributions of the different writers necessarily are, it is becoming increasingly evident that this is to be the standard English commentary for the student of the opening years of the twentieth century. The present volume follows the plan of the preceding numbers. A paraphrase of each paragraph or shorter section of the epistle is followed by very full notes upon separate words and phrases. The notes are, in some cases perhaps, too elementary, as, *e. g.*, on 1:12, κατ' ἐμέ, where it is explained that "*against* me . . . . would require ἐμοῦ." On the other hand, a grammatical note is occasionally insufficient, as on 1:10, where, besides the statement that "εἰς governing the infinitive with τὸ is frequent in Paul," we should expect a reference to the question whether the phrase expresses purpose or result.